

PART 2 INDEPENDENT GROUPS

Chapter 18: Teamsters

During the reelection campaign of International Brotherhood of Teamsters President Ron Carey, consultants to the campaign, including Carey's campaign manager and Martin Davis, launched a contribution-swapping scheme to help raise money for the Carey campaign. As these consultants have acknowledged in court proceedings, they illegally asked a number of groups to donate money to Carey's campaign in exchange for donations to those groups from the Teamsters. As a small part of this scheme, Davis sought the help of DNC officials in locating wealthy individuals willing to give money to Carey's campaign and promised greater Teamsters donations to the Democratic state parties in return. Evidence gathered by the Committee suggests that DNC officials took little action in response to this request, but that they did make an ultimately unsuccessful effort at directing to the Carey campaign the donation of an individual who sought to donate to the DNC, but whose foreign citizenship made her ineligible to make that donation.

FINDINGS

(1) The evidence before the Committee indicates that the DNC's efforts at finding a donor for the Carey campaign were limited to exploring the legality of a possible donation from one individual to the Carey campaign, but that donation did not ultimately occur because the potential donor was not eligible, under labor laws and Teamsters' rules, to contribute to the Carey campaign.

(2) Nevertheless, Martin Davis's comments to DNC officials should have led them to suspect that Davis was improperly seeking to influence the use of Teamsters funds to benefit the Carey campaign. DNC officials should have immediately refused to take any action in response to Davis's request.

TEAMSTER CONTRIBUTIONS

Martin Davis, a consultant for the reelection campaign of Teamster's president Ron Carey, pleaded guilty to participating in an illegal scheme to funnel money from the Teamsters union treasury to the Carey campaign. In his plea agreement, Davis stated, under oath, that he told "individuals, including a former official of the Clinton Campaign '96 Re-election Committee and the Democratic National Committee, that I wanted to help the DNC with the fundraising from labor groups, including the Teamsters" and that he "wanted to help raise more money from the Teamsters than they originally anticipated."¹ Jere Nash, who was running Carey's campaign and who also pleaded guilty to participating in the illegal scheme, stated under oath that Davis told him that he had spoken to "a representative of the Clinton-Gore campaign" and had told this representative that he (Davis) would help raise large amounts of money from the Teamsters "in

exchange for” the DNC finding donors for the Carey campaign.²

Martin Davis’s Initial Contacts With DNC Officials

Martin Davis was the part-owner and president of a company called the November Group, which provided direct mail services for organizations and political candidates. He was also a consultant for Ron Carey’s campaign to be re-elected president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. In May or June of 1996, Davis contacted Terry McAuliffe, Clinton campaign finance chairman. At the time, McAuliffe was helping to raise money for the Clinton campaign and the DNC, and he maintained an office at Clinton campaign headquarters.³ McAuliffe had known Davis since approximately 1984.⁴

Davis told McAuliffe that he wanted to help raise a half-million dollars from labor unions for the DNC.⁵ McAuliffe does not recall Davis specifically asking for assistance in raising money for the Carey campaign,⁶ but conceded that Davis might have said something in the nature of, “Terry, I’d love it if you could help me. I am running Ron Carey’s campaign.”⁷ However, McAuliffe also testified that he saw no connection between Davis’s offer to raise money for the DNC from labor and his suggestion that McAuliffe’s help in raising money for the Carey campaign would be welcome.⁸ McAuliffe said he thanked Davis for his willingness to assist in raising funds from organized labor and referred him to Laura Hartigan, who was serving as the Clinton campaign finance director. McAuliffe explained to Davis that Hartigan could put him in touch with the appropriate people at the DNC.⁹ McAuliffe then brought Davis into Hartigan’s office,¹⁰ where Davis told Hartigan that he wanted to be the “point person” to coordinate raising labor funds for the DNC.¹¹ McAuliffe testified that he never spoke with Davis again concerning this subject¹² and did not pursue it further.¹³

In response to this contact, Hartigan told Davis that she would speak to someone at the DNC.¹⁴ Shortly after that meeting, Hartigan called DNC Finance Director Richard Sullivan to tell him that Davis would be calling regarding his desire to raise labor money for the DNC.¹⁵ Hartigan did not ask Sullivan to do anything other than talk to Davis.¹⁶

Davis then contacted Sullivan directly and indicated that he was working to raise money from the Teamsters and asked whether the DNC could be helpful in raising money for the Carey campaign.¹⁷ Sullivan took no immediate action to pursue this request.¹⁸ In fact, Sullivan testified that he was indifferent to Davis’s request, in part because he was confident that labor would support the DNC regardless of whether the party found a donor for the Carey campaign:

I had no doubt whatsoever that the IBT would support the DNC. It had done so in the past, on the merits of labor issues, and there was no reason whatsoever to believe that would change in 1996. In that sense, Davis wasn't offering much. The IBT was already a DNC supporter. Others were already actively working to raise money from it. Thus, we didn't need Davis to devise ways to entice the IBT as an ally.¹⁹

There is no evidence that anyone suggested to Sullivan that Davis's help in raising money for the DNC from the Teamsters was conditioned upon or was a quid pro quo for the DNC's assistance in raising money for Carey.²⁰ Indeed, it was Sullivan's impression that Davis wanted to help the DNC regardless of whether the DNC was helpful in finding support for the Carey campaign.²¹ Similarly, it was never Hartigan's understanding that Davis was suggesting some sort of quid pro quo or a nexus between raising money for Carey and raising funds for the DNC.²² Rather, it was her feeling that labor was going to donate to the DNC anyway, and Davis was not needed to get money from the labor unions.²³

Judith Vasquez's Contribution to Vote Now '96

On June 9, 1996, a DNC fundraising event was held at the home of investment banker Richard Blum in Northern California.²⁴ In late June or early July 1996, Mark Thomann became the California DNC director and one of his first responsibilities was to collect the outstanding contribution commitments from the Blum event.²⁵ One of the pledges that had not been collected was a \$100,000 commitment by Judith Vazquez, the chairman and CEO of Duvaz Pacific, a Philippine company, to Vote '96, a tax-exempt get-out-the-vote organization.²⁶

When Sullivan asked Thomann about the commitments, Thomann told him that a Philippine woman (i.e., Vazquez) was interested in contributing, but that Thomann and attorneys for Vasquez had determined that, as a foreign national, she was prohibited from contributing to the DNC.²⁷ The hosts of the fundraiser had not known until shortly before the event that Vazquez was not a U.S. resident and therefore not able to contribute to the DNC.²⁸ Because she had traveled all the way from the Philippines, she was allowed to attend the fundraiser without making a contribution.²⁹ Through her counsel, Vasquez inquired about the legality of making an "in-kind" contribution to the DNC by underwriting a future fundraiser. Thomann researched this possibility by consulting the DNC's general counsel's office and the FEC, both of whom advised him that even in-kind contributions from foreign nationals were prohibited.³⁰

Several days later, knowing that Thomann was continuing to consult with attorneys for Vazquez to see "what other support she might offer," Sullivan said he had asked Thomann if Vazquez would consider making a contribution to the Carey campaign, if such a contribution was appropriate.³¹ Sullivan said he did not direct Thomann to solicit the contribution, but rather asked him to determine whether such a contribution would be legal.³² Sullivan explained to Thomann that any contribution to the Carey campaign had to be from an individual, and that the individual could not be an employer.³³

According to Thomann, Sullivan asked if the contribution for Vote '96 had been sent, and when he responded that it had not, Sullivan told him that there was "a change in direction" for the contribution.³⁴ Thomann testified that Sullivan did not tell him why Vazquez was to be asked to contribute to the Carey campaign.³⁵ Sullivan testified that he does not recall whether he ever told Davis he thought he could get Vazquez or another individual to contribute to the Carey campaign, but acknowledges that he may have told Davis that he was having a conversation with Thomann.³⁶

A few days after the call from Sullivan, Thomann was contacted by Nathaniel Charney, an attorney for the Teamsters, regarding the possible contribution from Vazquez.³⁷ Thomann felt that Charney was pressuring him to secure this contribution immediately, which made him uncomfortable.³⁸ It was ultimately determined that because Vazquez was an employer, she could not contribute to the Carey campaign.³⁹ At that point, Thomann told Charney that Vazquez could not make a contribution and that he was “recusing” himself from the process.⁴⁰ According to Thomann, Charney was disappointed and continued to pressure him.⁴¹

Thomann also informed Sullivan of his conclusion that Vazquez could not contribute, because she had employees, and that he was stepping out of the process.⁴² According to Thomann, Sullivan exerted “absolutely no pressure” on him to come up with the contribution.⁴³ Thomann testified that Sullivan did not ask him to find another donor, or to find another way to get a contribution to the Carey campaign.⁴⁴ Thomann also testified that Sullivan never raised the issue with Thomann again.⁴⁵ Sullivan testified that he subsequently told Davis that the DNC was not going to be able to refer a contributor to the Carey campaign.⁴⁶ Vazquez ultimately donated \$100,000 to Vote ‘96.⁴⁷

Teamsters’ Contributions

In early June, Hartigan was asked by Davis for information on how the Teamsters could make contributions to certain Democratic state parties. Hartigan obtained information from the DNC about contributions that could be legally made and forwarded that information to Davis in a memorandum dated June 12, 1996.⁴⁸ Davis forwarded the memorandum to Teamsters headquarters.⁴⁹ A June 21 memorandum from Bill Hamilton, the Teamsters’ director of government affairs, to Greg Mullenholz, the individual responsible for processing contribution requests made to the Teamsters, asked Mullenholz to have contribution checks issued to certain state Democratic parties.⁵⁰ The parties listed correspond to the parties listed in the June 12 Hartigan memorandum.

That same month, the Teamsters gave \$236,000 to state Democratic parties. A DNC record of Directed-Donor Checks Received to-Date lists several contributions received on June 26, 1996 credited to McAuliffe: a \$25,000 contribution from the Teamsters to the Illinois Democratic Party, a \$25,000 contribution from the Teamsters to the California Democratic Party, and \$5,000 from the Teamsters DRIVE Political Fund to the states listed on the two memoranda.⁵¹ Mullenholz testified that these contributions were made in response to the Hartigan memorandum.⁵²

During this same period of time, Davis continued in his unsuccessful efforts to get Sullivan to locate a contributor to Carey’s re-election campaign. Overall, Davis placed roughly 30 calls to Sullivan concerning finding a donor for TCFU, but Sullivan spoke to Davis on only approximately two or three occasions.⁵³ In July or August, Sullivan and Davis had a conversation, during which Davis again said he hoped he could be helpful in raising labor money for the DNC and that the DNC would find a contributor for the Carey campaign.⁵⁴

Sullivan testified that he told Davis that it was unlikely that he would be able to find someone to contribute to Carey.⁵⁵ He gave Davis two tickets to Clinton's birthday party at Radio City Music Hall on August 19 as a "consolation."⁵⁶ Sullivan testified that he was unaware of anyone else from the DNC soliciting anyone else for a contribution to the Carey campaign.⁵⁷

Sullivan also testified that he discussed Davis's request with others at the DNC, but he did not ask them to take any action.⁵⁸ According to Sullivan, Marvin Rosen, the DNC's finance chairman, discouraged the plan but told him to see whether the White House had heard anything about it.⁵⁹ Sullivan testified that he did not contact the White House,⁶⁰ and there is no evidence that anyone at the White House was contacted by Sullivan or by anyone else regarding this issue.

In August, in response to several telephone calls from Davis seeking a list of state parties to which the Teamsters could contribute, Hartigan asked Sullivan to compile such a list.⁶¹ The DNC provided the information to Hartigan and on August 10, she forwarded to Davis a memorandum under Sullivan's name listing the state parties and seeking approximately \$1 million in contributions.⁶² Davis sent the memo to Bill Hamilton, the political director for the Teamsters, with a cover memo stating that he would let Hamilton know when the DNC had "fulfilled their commitment."⁶³ Hartigan testified, however, that she was not aware of any commitments the DNC made to the Teamsters or Ron Carey.⁶⁴ In September and October, the Teamsters contributed to state parties and some of the contributions correlated with the requests made in the memorandum.

SULLIVAN'S ROLE

Some members of the Committee suggested that Sullivan may have perjured himself in his September 5, 1997 deposition when he disavowed any knowledge of a person named Judith Vazquez.⁶⁵ They point to Sullivan's notes, which contain the name Judith Vazquez,⁶⁶ and Mark Thomann's deposition testimony that it was his understanding from his conversations with Sullivan that Sullivan knew who Vazquez was.

At the hearing, Sullivan did not dispute Thomann's testimony regarding Vazquez, but explained that, at his deposition, he had not recalled that name or remembered who she was.⁶⁷ "I don't deny that I knew about Judith Vazquez at the time I talked to Mark Thomann. A year-and-a-half later, I didn't remember who she was."⁶⁸ At his deposition, despite not having recognized Vazquez's name, Sullivan was forthcoming about all of the relevant circumstances surrounding the transaction being examined by the Committee, including the fact that he had had a conversation with Thomann about a potential donor to Carey's campaign,⁶⁹ that Thomann was working with this potential donor's lawyers to determine the legality of the proposed contributions,⁷⁰ and that the potential donor was a female with interests in the Philippines.⁷¹ At the hearing, refreshed with his notes and other testimony, Sullivan remembered that the donor's name was Vazquez.⁷² When Sullivan's deposition and hearing testimony is viewed in its entirety, given his testimony on the underlying facts of what happened, Sullivan's failure to recall the specific name of the donor does not appear to have been an attempt to mislead the Committee.

This is reinforced by Sullivan's testimony where he recounted the events surrounding this donor.

Some members of the Committee also questioned whether Richard Sullivan may have perjured himself in his September 5, 1997 deposition when he testified that he did not do anything specific to raise money for Ron Carey and did not ask anyone to try to raise money for Carey.⁷³ It was suggested that this testimony was an attempt to mislead the Committee and was contradicted by Thomann's deposition and hearing testimony detailing his conversations with Sullivan.⁷⁴ However, a complete reading of Sullivan's deposition sheds doubt on these allegations.⁷⁵ Sullivan testified about specific conversations with Thomann, but simply disagreed with his questioners at both the deposition and in the hearing that his request of Thomann to look into the legality of Vazquez's potential contribution to the Carey campaign was, in fact, an attempt to raise money for Carey. Sullivan testified that Thomann "responded back that [Vazquez's contribution would not be] legal, and I said fine. So I did not ask Mark to ask her to contribute."⁷⁶ For his part, Thomann agreed with this characterization, testifying at the hearing that he had no knowledge of "any DNC official ever solicit[ing] a contribution that was made to the Ron Carey Presidential campaign or the Teamsters for a Corruption-Free Union."⁷⁷ Again, in light of the fact that Sullivan voluntarily provided the details of his involvement in the proposed Vazquez contribution, the questioned statements do not appear to have been an attempt to mislead the Committee.

PROPOSED CONTRIBUTION TO UNITY '96

In October 1996 -- several months after the possible Vazquez contribution to the Teamsters was determined to be inappropriate -- Martin Davis and Terry McAuliffe discussed the possibility of locating an individual willing to donate \$100,000 to the Carey campaign in exchange for a \$500,000 contribution by the Teamsters to Unity '96,⁷⁸ a joint fundraising effort by the DNC, DSCC, and DCCC to raise money for the 1996 elections.⁷⁹ McAuliffe was one of the persons behind the creation of Unity '96 and raised funds for it, but played no role in the actual administration of the project.⁸⁰ Each Unity '96 official who was subsequently informed about Davis's request to secure a contributor for the Carey campaign in order to facilitate a contribution to Unity '96 rejected the suggestion out of hand and did not pursue the possibility.

DCCC Executive Director Rejected the Proposal

McAuliffe discussed the possibility of locating a contributor for Carey's campaign with Matt Angle, the executive director of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee ("DCCC").⁸¹ Angle is also involved in the fundraising efforts of the DCCC.⁸² Around October, Angle initiated a discussion with McAuliffe concerning fundraising. In the course of the conversation, McAuliffe asked if they knew anyone who could or would write a check to Carey. He said that if Unity '96 could get someone to donate to the Carey campaign, donations might come from the Teamsters to Unity '96. Specific amounts were not discussed, nor was it suggested that a smaller donation to the Carey campaign might result in a larger Teamsters donation to Unity '96.⁸³

Angle testified that he was dismissive of the idea and told McAuliffe that he would not take the idea to the chairman of the DCCC, Rep. Martin Frost (D-Tex.).⁸⁴ Angle testified in his deposition that the idea did not make sense for two reasons. First, the DCCC had made it a practice not to get involved in internal union politics.⁸⁵ Second, it was convoluted, in that the DCCC wanted to find donors for Unity '96, not some other entity.⁸⁶ He knew it was not something that Frost would be interested in.⁸⁷ He did not consider the idea seriously enough to begin to think about whether it would be legal or not.⁸⁸ McAuliffe accepted Angle's response and told him to let him know if he heard anything.⁸⁹ McAuliffe did not bring the subject up with Angle again.⁹⁰

DCCC Chairman Rejected the Proposal

Angle mentioned the conversation with McAuliffe to Frost that same day and told him that the DCCC was not interested in the idea. Angle said that Frost was also dismissive of the idea, for reasons Angle believed were similar to his own. In fact, Frost wanted to be sure that Angle had made it clear that the DCCC was not interested in the idea.⁹¹ Frost did not ask how much money was involved. Angle is not aware of Frost making telephone calls to any contributors or to anyone at the Teamsters concerning the idea.⁹²

DSCC Deputy Executive Director Rejected the Proposal

McAuliffe also brought up the idea in October at a Unity '96 meeting attended by Rita Lewis, the deputy executive director of the DSCC and a director of Unity '96.⁹³ McAuliffe said that if Unity '96 were able to find money for Carey's campaign, the Teamsters would be more likely to give to Unity '96. It was not Lewis's understanding that a contribution by the Teamsters to Unity '96 was conditional upon efforts to find a donor for Carey's campaign, but, rather, that Unity '96 would be more likely to receive a contribution if Carey were helped.⁹⁴ She characterized it as more of a statement of fact than a proposal.⁹⁵ McAuliffe did not indicate the genesis of this idea.⁹⁶ Lewis does not recall McAuliffe mentioning the amount of the contribution that Unity '96 might receive from the Teamsters.⁹⁷

Lewis dismissed the idea as something Unity '96 could not do because of political disagreements the DSCC was having with the Teamsters.⁹⁸ She does not recall anyone else reacting to McAuliffe's comment,⁹⁹ nor does she recall anyone being given an assignment in relation to the comments made by McAuliffe. She never discussed implementing the plan with anyone.¹⁰⁰ Lewis, who regularly attended Unity '96 meetings, remembers this subject coming up only that once.¹⁰¹ Because they did not pursue the idea, they did not assess the legality of it.¹⁰²

DSCC Chairman Rejected the Proposal

In mid-October, Lewis and Senator Bob Kerrey of Nebraska, who is the chairman of the DSCC, were discussing the Teamsters campaign contributions and an upcoming vote relating to the Federal Express labor dispute, and Lewis brought up the idea that McAuliffe had

mentioned.¹⁰³ According to Lews, Senator Kerrey dismissed the idea at that meeting because he believed the Teamsters faced more critical issues.¹⁰⁴

Senator Kerrey called Bernard Rapoport, a major Democratic contributor who is one of his close friends and advisors,¹⁰⁵ and according to Rapoport, said, “I want your opinion on something.”¹⁰⁶ Rapoport testified that Kerry then explained how the DNC¹⁰⁷ would benefit from raising funds for the Carey campaign and asked Rapoport what he thought.¹⁰⁸ Rapoport said, “It’s a bad idea.”¹⁰⁹ According to Rapoport, both he¹¹⁰ and Senator Kerrey said they did not like the idea, and that was the end of the conversation.¹¹¹ Rapoport testified that their discussion of this topic lasted no more than a minute-and-a-half to two minutes.¹¹² That was the only conversation Rapoport had with Senator Kerrey concerning Carey’s campaign.¹¹³ There is no evidence that the Senator made any efforts to find a contributor for Carey’s campaign.¹¹⁴

The Proposal and Unity ‘96

Ultimately, the Teamsters did not contribute to Unity ‘96.¹¹⁵ Other unions and union PACs did contribute to the effort.¹¹⁶ Hamilton, the Teamsters’ political director, had decided against donating to Unity ‘96 because of the recent votes of Democratic senators on labor issues.¹¹⁷ An October 23, 1996 memorandum from Hamilton to Carey states that Hamilton has “stopped all contributions to the Democratic Senate Campaign Committee because of the disappointing performance of Senate Democratic leaders, especially Democratic Leader Tom Daschle, on the Fed Ex vote two weeks ago just before they adjourned.”¹¹⁸

CONCLUSION

During the last election cycle, DNC officials discussed attempting to find a contributor to the Carey campaign, and undertook a few limited efforts in that regard. There was no evidence presented to the Committee, however, that a contribution swap ever occurred. Although Davis has suggested that his proposal to raise money for the DNC was a quid pro quo, all of the Democratic Party officials involved deny any contribution swap and the evidence indicates that no swap occurred. The Teamsters made initial contributions to State Democratic Parties, but stopped after anti-labor votes by Senate Democrats.

1. United States v. Martin Davis and Micahel Ansara, 9/18/97, pp. 25-26.
2. United States v. Jere Nash, 9/18/97, p. 23.
3. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, pp. 7-11.
4. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, p. 51.
5. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, pp. 59, 63.
6. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, p. 62.
7. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, p. 62.
8. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, p. 81.
9. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, p. 59.
10. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, pp. 11-12.
11. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 13.
12. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, p. 60.
13. Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, pp. 88-89.
14. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 13.
15. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 3; Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 13 .
16. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 13.
17. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 4.
18. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 5.
19. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 91.
20. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 90-91.
21. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 4; see also Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 144, 178-81.
22. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 24.
23. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 20.

24. Exhibit 1401.
25. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 7; Richard Sullivan, Hrg., 10/9/97 p. 127.
26. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 9 & 122.
27. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 7; Richard Sullivan, Hrg., 10/9/97 p. 128.
28. Exhibit 1415: Statement of Richard Blum.
29. Exhibit 1415: Statement of Richard Blum.
30. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 95.
31. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 8.
32. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 38.
33. Mark Thomann deposition, 9/23/97, p. 38.
34. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 9, 72-73; Mark Thomann deposition, 9/23/97, p. 38. Sullivan does not recall using the phrase "change of direction." Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 129.
35. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 16, 61-62.
36. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 132.
37. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 17-18.
38. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 29, 75.
39. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 41.
40. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 22-24.
41. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 41.
42. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 25.
43. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 25.
44. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 42; Mark Thomann deposition, 9/23/97, p. 49; Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 146.
45. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 42-43.

46. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 146.
47. Exhibit 1409.
48. Exhibit 1422.
49. Exhibit 1422.
50. S 004820 - 004823.
51. Exhibit 15 to Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97; Terence R. McAuliffe deposition, 9/18/97, p. 112.
52. Gregory C. Mullenholz deposition, 9/15/97, pp. 99-100.
53. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 113.
54. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 6; Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 136; Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, pp. 20-21.
55. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, p. 6; Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 139.
56. Statement of Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97, pp. 6-7.
57. Richard Sullivan deposition, 9/5/97, pp. 118-119.
58. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 144-45.
59. Richard Sullivan deposition, 9/5/97, pp. 181-82.
60. Richard Sullivan deposition, 9/5/97, pp. 183-84, 197.
61. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 92.
62. Exhibit 1423.
63. Exhibit 1423.
64. Laura Hartigan deposition, 9/16/97, p. 104.
65. Robert F. Bauer, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 126.
66. Exhibit 1420: Richard Sullivan's notes regarding Vazquez.
67. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 125-26.
68. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 126.

69. Richard Sullivan deposition, 9/5/97, pp. 95-96.
70. Richard Sullivan deposition, 9/5/97, p. 119.
71. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 126, 148-49; Richard Sullivan deposition, 9/5/97, p. 134.
72. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 149.
73. Senator Specter, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 170.
74. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 171; Exhibit 1419.
75. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg. pp. 170-73.
76. Richard Sullivan, 10/9/97 Hrg., p. 173.
77. Mark Thomann, 10/9/97 Hrg., pp. 47-48.
78. According to Davis, it was McAuliffe that first approached him to ask if he would attempt to raise \$500,000 for Unity '96. Davis plea, p. 27.
79. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 26.
80. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 27, 33; Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 9, 13.
81. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 9.
82. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 9.
83. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, pp. 43-45, 47, 52.
84. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 45. Angle did not recall McAuliffe asking him to take the idea to Frost. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 45.
85. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 46.
86. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, pp. 46-47, 51-52.
87. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, pp. 46-47.
88. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, pp. 64-65. In an October 22, 1997 Washington Times article Michael Tucker, a spokesman for the DSCC and Senator Kerrey, said that the idea was dismissed "largely because it was so impractical." He also stated: "It would have been illegal, and that was part of the reason for not acting -- for dismissing it."

89. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 46.
90. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 49.
91. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, pp. 50-53.
92. Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, p. 67.
93. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 6.
94. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 15-18, 22-23.
95. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 55.
96. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 57.
97. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 29.
98. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 17, 54-55.
99. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 17.
100. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 18, 58.
101. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 15, 50-51.
102. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 18, 24-25.
103. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 18-21.
104. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 18-21.
105. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 53; Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, p. 77.
106. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, p. 35.
107. According to Rapoport, Kerrey did not mention Unity '96. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, p. 49.
108. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, pp. 35, 48-49.
109. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, p. 89.
110. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, pp. 44 & 83-84.
111. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, p. 35.

112. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, p. 78.

113. Bernard Rapoport deposition, 10/20/97, pp. 39, 66.

114. See, e.g., Matthew H. Angle deposition, 10/28/97, pp. 46, 62; Rita Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 18-21.

115. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 41.

116. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, pp. 41-42.

117. U.S. v. Nash, 9/18/97, p. 24.

118. S 004920. The memorandum continues, "I was asked as recently as yesterday by Sen. Kerrey, chairman of the DSCC, to reconsider. He asked for \$500,000; I said no." While the Majority might attempt to connect this request by Kerrey -- and the amount he requested -- to the alleged contribution swap scheme, there is no evidence to support this. In fact, Lewis testified that Kerrey routinely called PAC contributors and national contributors to ask them to give money to the DSCC. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 29. According to Lewis, the DSCC solicited the Teamsters for a large contribution because they knew that the Teamsters had funds readily available. Rita M. Lewis deposition, 10/27/97, p. 29.